RANGELAND REVEGETATION MONITORING ON TWO PIPELINE RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN SOUTHERN ALBERTA



NOVA Gas Transmission

RANGELAND REVEGETATION MONITORING

ON TWO

PIPELINE RIGHTS-OF-WAY

IN

SOUTHERN ALBERTA

by

M. A. Naeth, A. T. Lees, J. Bietz, B. D. Irving and A. W. Fedkenheuer

Environmental Research Monograph 1997-2

NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. Community Resources Calgary, Alberta

1997

FOREWORD

NOVA Corporation (NOVA) is a major Canadian energy company involved in pipelining and the manufacturing and marketing of produced petrochemicals. NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. (NGTL) of NOVA is concerned with natural gas system design, pipeline construction, research and facility operations throughout the province of Alberta. Since its incorporation in 1954, NGTL has installed more than 21,700 km of natural gas pipeline and continues to operate, maintain, and expand this system.

NGTL Environment Research Monographs are published verbatim from the final reports of professional environmental consultants or company staff. Only proprietary technical or budget-related information is withheld. Since NGTL decisions are not necessarily based on one person's opinion, recommendations found in the text should not be construed as commitments to action by the company.

NGTL welcomes public and scientific interest in its environmental activities. Please address any questions, comments, or requests for reports to:

Manager, Community Resources, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd., P.O. Box 2535, Postal Station M, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2N6

This study was commissioned to assess rangeland revegetation productivity, species composition, and forage utilization by cattle on and off two pipeline rights-of-way in southern Alberta. The report was prepared by M. A. Naeth, University of Alberta, A. T. Lees, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd., J. Bietz, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd., B. D. Irving, University of Alberta, and A. W. Fedkenheuer, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd.. This report may be cited as:

Naeth, M. A., A. T. Lees, J. Bietz, B.D. Irving and A. W. Fedkenheuer. 1997. Rangeland revegetation monitoring on two pipeline rights-of-way in southern Alberta. NGTL Environmental Research Monographs 1997-2. NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd., Calgary, Alberta. 58 pp.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ad Lawrence

- Clarker

And a second second

FORJ	EWO	RD	.ii	
LIST	LIST OF TABLES			
LIST	OF F	FIGURES	.v	
		CT		
ACK		LEDGEMENTS		
I.		RODUCTION		
П.	STU	DY SITE DESCRIPTIONS	.1	
	A.	Milo Lateral		
		1. Site 1	-	
		2. Site 2	.4	
		3. Site 3	.5	
		4. Site 4	.5	
		5. Milo Lateral Reclamation	.6	
	B.	Porcupine Hills Lateral	.7	
		1. Rowland Site	.7	
		2. Davies Site	.8	
		3. Waldron Site	.9	
		4. Cyr Site	.9	
		5. Porcupine Hills Lateral Reclamation	.10	
III.	STU	DY DESIGN AND METHODS	.11	
	A.	Grazing Exclosures	.11	
	В.	Transects	.11	
	C.	Cover	.11	
	D.	Productivity	.13	
	E.	Cattle Utilization	.13	
	F.	Statistical Analyses	.14	
IV.	RES	ULTS AND DISCUSSION	.15	
	Α.	Production	.15	
	B.	Cover	.17	
		1. Milo Sites	17	
		2. Porcupine Hills Sites	27	
	C.	Utilization		
	D.	Seeded Versus Unseeded Treatments	34	
V.	SUN	IMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	38	
VI.	BIB	LIOGRAPHY	40	
VⅡ.	APF	ENDICES	41	
	I.	Species List For The Study Sites	41	
		A. Milo Sites		
		B. Porcupine Hills Sites		
	П.	Standard Errors and Significances For The Study Sites		

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Milo Lateral native seed mix	7	
Table 2.	Milo Lateral non-native seed mix	7	
Table 3.	Porcupine Hills Lateral seed mix	10	
Table 4.	Grass, forb and total herbaceous production means for main effects and two		
	way interactions for the Milo and Porcupine Hills sites	16	
Table 5.	Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way		
	interactions for Milo sites seeded to native species	24	
Table 6.	Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way		
	interactions for Milo sites seeded to non-native species	24	
Table 7.	Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way		
	interactions for the Porcupine Hills sites	32	
Table 8.	Grass, forb and total herbaceous percent utilization for main effects and two		
	way interactions for the Milo and Porcupine Hills sites	35	
Table 9.	Total grass and herbaceous production means for main effects and two way		
	interactions at Milo Site 4	38	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Rangeland revegetation study areas	2
Figure 2.	Typical plot layout	12
Figure 3.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites	
	seeded to native species; bare ground and litter cover are included	18
Figure 4.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites	
	seeded to non-native species; bare ground and litter cover are included	. 19
Figure 5.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites	
	seeded to native species; bare ground and litter cover are excluded	21
Figure 6.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites	
	seeded to non-native species; bare ground and litter cover are excluded	22
Figure 7.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites	
	seeded to non-native and native species; bare ground and litter cover are (a)	
	included and (b) excluded	23
Figure 8.	Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at the Milo sites	
	seeded to native species	25
Figure 9.	Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at the Milo sites	
	seeded to non-native species	26
Figure 10.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for the	
	Porcupine Hills sites; bare ground and litter cover are included	28
Figure 11.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for the	
	Porcupine Hills sites; bare ground and litter cover are excluded	29
Figure 12.	Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Porcupine	
	Hills sites; bare ground and litter are (a) included and (b) excluded	30
Figure 13.	Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at Porcupine Hills	
	sites	31
Figure 14.	Ratio of non-native versus total cover at the Porcupine Hills sites	33
Figure 15.	Percent cover of total vegetation, litter and bare ground in seeded and	
	unseeded areas at Milo Site 4	36
Figure 16.	Percent cover of individual species in seeded and unseeded areas at Milo Site 4	37

ABSTRACT

Field sites for this study were established in 1987 shortly after the completion of construction of two pipelines in southern Alberta. The Dry Mixed Grass and Mixed Grass Ecoregions (Milo Pipeline Lateral) and the Aspen Parkland, Montane and Fescue Grassland Ecoregions (Porcupine Hills Lateral) were selected for study plots to compare vegetative productivity, plant species composition and animal utilization on the pipeline right-of-way to that of the adjacent native grassland. Field assessments were conducted over four growing seasons.

Grass production decreased, as expected, in the first year after construction, but it then increased, and in the Dry Mixed Grass and Mixed Grass Ecoregions, often exceeded predisturbance levels. Grass production was higher on unseeded than seeded areas. Forb production showed an increase in the first year after the disturbance, and generally remained higher on disturbed treatments than on the control over time. Total herbaceous production showed a general increase with time on all disturbed treatments, particularly at the Milo sites, due to the increase in grass production.

Bare ground was not significantly different between the disturbed areas seeded to native species and the adjacent native grasslands, within four years of construction. For areas seeded to non-native species bare ground was still significantly higher in disturbed areas. After four years litter on areas seeded to native species was greater on the pipeline trench than in the adjacent control area. For all disturbed areas seeded with non-native species, litter was greater than for the controls.

A lack of little club moss on study sites in the Dry Mixed Grass and Mixed Grass Ecoregions resulted in less similarity between disturbed and undisturbed sites over time, especially in areas seeded to non-native species. In the Aspen Parkland, Montane and Fescue Grassland Ecoregions, plant species composition became more similar over time between the pipeline right-of-way and the adjacent control.

Grazing did not show a discernible effect on cover. There were strong, but highly variable trends for higher overall forage utilization on the pipeline trench than in undisturbed control areas at all sites.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the financial assistance of NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. (NGTL) for this project. The assistance of Debra Smith, Dan Axelsson and NGTL's Land team in site selection and establishment is also acknowledged, as is the cooperation of the various landowners or managers where the rangeland exclosures were established. These include: Eugene Cyr, Circle E Grazing Association, Ron Davies, Francis Gardiner, Lomond Grazing Association, Gene Rowland and the Waldron Grazing Association. A thank you also to Tracy Patterson for her efforts in editing and publishing the report.

I. INTRODUCTION

NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. (NGTL) is an Alberta based company involved in the transportation of natural gas. NGTL operates approximately 21,700 km of pipeline and consequently has an extensive reclamation program. Many of these pipelines are constructed in native grasslands, which can pose problems for successful re-establishment of an acceptable vegetative cover.

Native rangeland is an important resource for both domestic animals and wildlife. A disturbance such as a pipeline right-of-way (RoW) is often seeded with non-native plant species, which can make management of the adjacent native range more difficult. These non-native species often differ from native species in palatability to livestock, so the pipeline changes normal grazing patterns in a given field. Animals tend to preferentially graze non-native species, thereby increasing grazing pressure and limiting reclamation success.

In 1986, NGTL initiated a long-term revegetation monitoring program to assess revegetation efforts on native rangelands in southeastern and southwestern Alberta. The purpose of the rangeland revegetation monitoring program was to:

- 1. Compare vegetative productivity of the pipeline RoW to that of the adjacent native grassland,
- 2. Compare plant species composition on the pipeline RoW to that of the adjacent native grassland, and
- 3. Compare animal utilization of the pipeline RoW to that of the adjacent native grassland.

This report presents the results of vegetation assessments conducted in 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991.

Numerous individuals were involved in this project. The sampling layout was designed by J. Derosie, A.T. Lees and A.W. Fedkenheuer of NGTL. The soil inventory of the Milo Lateral was conducted by R. McNeil and N. Finlayson and that of the Porcupine Hills Lateral by N. Finlayson. Field vegetation data collection was conducted by Eastern Slopes Rangeland Consultants. M.A. Naeth and B.D. Irving, of the University of Alberta, completed the data analyses and interpretation.

II. STUDY SITE DESCRIPTIONS

The pipelines monitored were the Milo Lateral, located in southeastern Alberta, and the Porcupine Hills Lateral, located in southwestern Alberta (Figure 1).



A. Milo Lateral

The Milo RoW, 39 km long and 18 m wide, was built in southeastern Alberta in the summer of 1986. This lateral transports sweet natural gas from the Milo Meter Station at SW-31-18-19-W4 to the Badger East Meter Station at NE-13-16-17-W4. Topsoil conservation involved ditchline stripping with the stripped soil stockpiled on the work side of the RoW.

The Milo Lateral traverses the Dry Mixed Grass and Mixed Grass Ecoregions which are characterized by undulating topography, Brown Chernozemic soils and a subxeric soil water regime with the lowest summer precipitation of any ecoregion in Alberta. May through August are the hottest months with a monthly mean of 16.2 °C. These temperatures combined with low precipitation (210 mm summer⁻¹, 340 mm yr⁻¹) and strong persistent winds, produce potential evapotranspiration deficits that exceed 100 mm mo⁻¹. There is shallow snow cover and only a few days when snow cover is continuous.

Plant species reflect severe summer moisture deficits (Appendix I A). Dominant species include needle and thread (*Stipa comata*) and porcupine grass (*Stipa curtiseta*), with secondary occurrences of blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*). Other common species are little club moss (*Selaginella densa*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), moss phlox (*Phlox hoodii*) and thread-leaved sedge (*Carex filifolia*).

All four study sites on this lateral are located on property managed by the Lomond and Circle E Grazing Associations.

1. Site One

Legal: NW-23-16-17-W4M Ecoregion: Dry Mixed Grass Parent Material: Fine-loamy till Topography: Very gently to gently undulating Drainage: Well to moderately well drained Stoniness: Slightly stony

Vegetation: Dominant species are blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), needle and thread (*Stipa comata*) and little club moss (*Selaginella densa*). June grass (*Koeleria macrantha*), wheatgrasses (*Agropyron spp.*), bluegrasses (*Poa spp.*), sand dropseed (*Sporobolus cryptandrus*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), moss phlox (*Phlox hoodii*) and sedges (*Carex spp.*) are common.

Soils: Soils at this site are the most variable of the Milo sites, with seven soil map units delineated. Brown Solods dominate with occurrences of Solonetzic Brown Chernozems and Brown and Gleyed Brown Solodized Solonetzes. Soil pH ranges from 6.0 to 9.0. Soil electrical conductivity ranges from 0.14 to 20.10 mS cm⁻¹. Blowouts are common. Soil organic carbon ranges from 0.9 to 2.3% on the trench and 2.1 to 2.5% off the trench.

Grazing History:

1987	316 cattle	September 5 to October 5
1988	448 cattle	
1989	305 cattle	June 16 to September 25
1990	1128 AUM	
1991	590 AUM	August 23 to September 27
		July 1 to 20, August 28 to September 3

2. Site Two

Legal: SE-27-16-17-W4M Ecoregion: Dry Mixed Grass Parent Material: Fine-loamy till Topography: Very gently undulating Drainage: Well to moderately well drained Stoniness: Non to slightly stony

Vegetation: Vegetation is similar to Site 1, dominated by blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), needle and thread (*Stipa comata*) and little club moss (*Selaginella densa*) with common occurrences of June grass (*Koeleria macrantha*), wheatgrasses (*Agropyron spp.*), bluegrasses (*Poa spp.*), sand dropseed (*Sporobolus cryptandrus*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), moss phlox (*Phlox hoodii*) and sedges (*Carex spp.*).

Soils: Five map units have been identified on variations in profile, parent material, slope and drainage. Brown Solods dominate with significant occurrences of Brown Solodized Solonetz and some Solonetzic Brown and Orthic Brown Chernozems. Soil pH, electrical conductivity and organic carbon are similar to the values of Site 1.

Grazing History:

1987	74 cattle	May 1 to July 9
1988	153 cattle	May 1 to August 20
1989	89 cattle	May 1 to June 16
1990	547 AUM	June 9 to July 26
1991	133 AUM	June 24 to July 2
1992	166 AUM	June 24 to July 1

3. Site Three

Legal: NW-14-18-19-W4M Ecoregion: Mixed Grass Parent Material: Coarse loamy to fine-loamy till Topography: Depressional to strongly sloping to undulating crest Drainage: Moderately well to rapidly drained Stoniness: Non to exceedingly stony

Vegetation: Needle and thread (*Stipa comata*), June grass (*Koeleria macrantha*) and blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*) dominate the study area. Northern and western wheatgrasses (*Agropyron dasystachyum* and *smithii*), little club moss (*Selaginella densa*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), moss phlox (*Phlox hoodii*) and pin cushion cactus (*Mamillaria vivipara*) are common.

Soils: Five soil map units have been delineated; most are Orthic Dark Brown Chernozems. Some Eluviated, Rego and Calcareous Dark Browns also occur. Thin topsoils occur in one of the map units. Steep slopes, thin topsoils and extreme stoniness are common in two others. Soils are generally non-saline and non-sodic, although some map units are moderately alkaline. Soil organic carbon ranges from 1.7 to 2.6% off the trench and averages 1.3% on the trench.

Grazing History:

1987	.91 cattle	May 1 to October 1
	.91 cattle	•
	.91 cattle	
1990		•
	306 cows	August 3 to September 16
1991	721 AUM	
	107 cow/calf pairs plus 478 yearlings	
	30 cows	July 29 to August 3
1992	235 AUM	July to August

4. Site Four

Legal: NE-21-18-19-W4M Ecoregion: Mixed Grass Parent Material: Fine-loamy till Topography: Very gently to gently undulating or depressional Drainage: Well to imperfectly drained Stoniness: Non to moderately stony

Vegetation: Short and mid-grasses, with a variety of forbs, are common and dominate the vegetation. Dominant species are northern wheatgrass (*Agropyron dasystachyum*), needle and thread (*Stipa comata*) and June grass (*Koeleria macrantha*). Blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*) and bluegrass (*Poa spp.*) also occur. Little club moss (*Selaginella densa*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), pussytoes (*Antennaria spp.*) and snowberry (*Symphoricarpos alba*) are common throughout the study site.

Soils: Solonetzic Dark Brown Chernozems dominate two of the map units which comprise the majority of the site. There are some significant Orthic Dark Brown Chernozems as well as eroded Rego and Calcareous Dark Brown Chernozems. The Ah horizon in one of the map units on Rego and Calcareous Dark Brown Chernozems is eroded. Soil pH is slightly alkaline. Soils are neither saline nor sodic. Total organic carbon averages 1.9% on the trench and 2.8% off the trench.

Grazing History:

- 0		
1987	34 cattle	May 1 to October 1
1988	34 cattle	May 1 to July 8
1989	34 cattle	May 1 to October 11
1990	640 AUM	
	39 cows	May to August 1
	10 cows	May 10 to August 3
	190 cows	June 19 to August 3
	10 bulls	May 10
	755 cows	October 12-15
1991	1042 AUM	
	46 cow/calf pairs plus 287 yearlings	July 11
	60 yearlings	May 17
	25 cow/calf pairs	May 31
	8 cow/calf pairs plus 6 yearlings	June 14
	28 cow/calf pairs	June 22
	18 yearlings	July 4-11
	809 cow/calf pairs	•
1992	322 AUM	

1992...... 322 AUM

5. Milo Lateral Reclamation

Site 1 is seeded with a native species mix on the southern half and a non-native species mix on the northern half (Tables 1 and 2). Site 2 has the non-native species mix on the southern portion and the native species mix on the northern half. Sites 3 and 4 were seeded with native species. At Site 4, only half the exclosure was seeded.

Tuble 1. Ithic Eucoral mative beed mile.	Table 1.	Milo	Lateral	native	seed mix.
--	----------	------	---------	--------	-----------

Variety	% By Weight
Walsh	25
Elbee	25
Revenue	17
Reubens	8
Nuttall's	25
	Walsh Elbee Revenue Reubens

Table 2. Milo Lateral non-native seed mix.

Species	Variety	% By Weight
Crested Wheatgrass	Parkway	3
Russian Wild Rye	Swift	3
Streambank Wheatgrass	Sodar	6
Slender Wheatgrass	Revenue	3
Tall Wheatgrass	Orbit	7
Pubescent Wheatgrass	Greenleaf	6
Altai Wild Rye	Prairieland	12
Alfalfa	Rambler	12
Sanfoin	Common	33
Cicer Milkvetch	Oxley	17
	-	

B. Porcupine Hills Lateral

The Porcupine Hills RoW is 160 km long and 18 m wide, running from NW-6-20-2-W5 to NW-17-4-30-W4. Construction began in February and ended in May 1987. Topsoil was conserved through ditchline stripping, stockpiled on the working side of the RoW and replaced in summer 1987. Four study sites transect the Aspen Parkland, Montane and Fescue Grassland Ecoregions. The detailed list of plant species identified at each site is found in Appendix I B.

1. Rowland Site

Legal Location: NE 24-18-3-W5 Ecoregion: Aspen Parkland Parent Material: Medium to moderately fine textured till Topography: Undulating to gently rolling Drainage: Moderately well to well drained Stoniness: Non-stony **Vegetation**: Vegetation is dominated by rough fescue (*Festuca campestris*), three flowered avens (*Geum triflorum*), Parry's oat grass (*Danthonia parryi*), northern wheatgrass (*Agropyron dasystachyum*) and Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*). The first four species are native, while Kentucky bluegrass is non-native but has a low prominence value.

Soils: Soils are medium to moderately fine textured Calcareous Black Chernozems with inclusions of Orthic Black Chernozems. Topsoils range from 30 to 40 cm in depth, and are non-saline and non-sodic. Soil pH ranges from 7.3 to 7.7. Total organic carbon ranges from 0.2 to 5.4% and from 0.3 to 6.4% over the trench. Most soil parameters show little variability.

Grazing History:

2. Davies Site

Legal: NW-36-12-2-W5 Ecoregion: Aspen Parkland Parent Material: Moderately fine textured till Topography: Undulating to gently rolling Drainage: Moderately well to well drained Stoniness: Non-stony

Vegetation: Both aspen woodland and grasslands occur. Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*), timothy (*Phleum pratense*), rough fescue (*Festuca campestris*), white dutch clover (*Trifolium repens*), alsike clover (*Trifolium hybridum*) and wild strawberry (*Fragaria virginiana*) dominate.

Soils: Soils are uniformly textured Orthic and Rego Black Chernozems developed on till. Topsoils are less clayey than subsoils, and are 12 to 33 cm thick. Soils are non-saline and non-sodic with uniform cations and anions. Nitrates are very low throughout. Total organic carbon ranges from 0.2 to 4.9% and 0.2 to 3.8% on the trench. Soil pH ranges from 6.8 to 8.0.

Grazing History:

1989	42 yearlings	June 1 to September 30
1990	42 yearlings	June 1 to September 30
1991	42 yearlings	June 1 to September 30
1992	42 yearlings	June 1 to September 30

3. Waldron Site

Legal: SW-24-10-2-W5 Ecoregion: Fescue Grasslands Parent Material: Medium textured till, glacio-fluvial (gravelly in places) Topography: Gently undulating to gently rolling Drainage: Moderately well to well drained Stoniness: Non to moderately stony

Vegetation: Foothills Fescue and Mixed Prairie grassland communities are present. Dominant species are rough fescue (*Festuca campestris*), northern wheatgrass (*Agropyron dasystachyum*), pasture sage (*Artemisia frigida*), Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*) and little club moss (*Selaginella densa*). Little club moss, western porcupine grass, tufted white prairie aster, wild vetch and blazing star are indicative of a drier site where prairie species compete with the fescue community.

Soils: Soils vary more than at other sites on this pipeline. Four soil map units are delineated, with soils dominated by Orthic and Rego Black Chernozems. Soil pH ranges from 7.1 to 8.4. Total organic carbon ranges from 0.4 to 5.2% and from 1.3 to 3.7% over the trench.

Grazing History:

1989	54 AUM	No dates
1990	No data available	
1991	93 AUM	Holding field
	109 cow/calf pairs	August 14-18
	18 heifers and 118 cow/calf pairs	August 18-20
	49 cow/calf pairs	September 19
	59 cow/calf pairs	October 3-7
	158 dry cows	November 2-4
1992	98 AUM	Holding field
	1217 yearling heifers	September 25-27
	95 cow/calf pairs	October 15-18
	605 heifers and 92 dry cows	October 29-31

4. Cyr Site

Legal: NE-36-4-1-W5

Ecoregion: Montane

Parent Material: Medium textured, glacio-fluvial (gravelly)

Topography: Gently undulating

Drainage: Moderately well to well

Stoniness: Moderately to very stony

Vegetation: This study area is morainal with a rolling topography. It covers the Castle River south to Waterton National Park and the majority of the Porcupine Hills outside of the forest reserve. Dominant plant species include Parry's oat grass (*Danthonia parryi*), rough fescue (*Festuca campestris*), American hedysarum (*Hedysarum alpinum*) and Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*).

Soils: Soils are gravelly, sandy loam to loam textured Orthic Black Chernozems with similar profiles. Topsoils range from 19 to 30 cm, and average 24 cm. Soils are generally non-saline and non-sodic with little variability. Soil pH varies within the root zone from 5.3 to 6.4. Total organic carbon ranges from 2.9 to 7.2% on the trench and 1.0 to 8.0% off the trench. There is more total organic carbon at depth in the trench at this study site than at any of the other study sites on this pipeline.

Grazing History:

1989	38 cow/calf pairs	June 1 to September 30
1990	35 cow/calf pairs	June 1 to September 30
1991	80 cow/calf pairs	June 1 to July 31
1992	120 yearlings	June 1 to July 31

5. Porcupine Hills Lateral Reclamation

Reclamation was completed in fall 1987. The seed mix (Table 3) was applied at a rate of 10 kg ha¹ using a Truax Rangeland Seed Drill. Exclosures were established in the spring of 1988, prior to cattle grazing.

Species	Variety	% By Weight
Canada Bluegrass	Reubens	2
Hard Fescue	Durar	3
Rough Fescue	Common	14
Sheeps Fescue	Covar	3
June Grass	Common	3
Northern Wheatgrass	Elbee	15
Slender Wheatgrass	Revenue	10
Streambank Wheatgrass	Sodar	45
Alfalfa	Rangelander	5

Table 3. Porcupine Hills Lateral seed mix.

III. STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

A. Grazing Exclosures

A typical plot layout within and outside of the Porcupine Hills grazing exclosures is depicted in Figure 2. Grazing exclosures measuring 50 by 50 m were established on all study sites. Exclosures included the RoW and adjacent undisturbed native grassland. Exclosures were constructed after completion of seeding and prior to cattle grazing.

Grazing exclosures varied at the Milo sites. At Site 1, the 50 by 100 m exclosure was seeded to non-native species on the north and native species on the south half. The off-RoW transect was located west of the RoW, except on the unfenced north plot where the terrain changes, necessitating that it be located east of the RoW. At Site 2, the 50 by 100 m exclosure was seeded to non-native species on the south half and native species on the north. At both of these sites, there are 16 permanent line transects, 80 productivity plots and 20 production cages. At Site 3, the 50 by 178 m exclosure is located on a southeast facing slope. There are eight permanent line transects, forty productivity plots and ten utilization plots. The Site 4 exclosure is 50 by 100 m. The south half was seeded with native species, the north half was not seeded. There are nine permanent line transects and an additional line transect over the ditchline in the unseeded area. There are 60 productivity plots and 10 production cages.

B. Transects

Four 30 m line transects were established both inside and outside the exclosure (eight per site). Transects on the RoW were located on work, trench and spoil areas with a 10 m buffer between the exclosure fence and the start of each transect to ensure that cattle trailing and grazing along the exclosure fenceline did not impact on the permanent line transects.

C. Cover

Vegetation within and outside the exclosures was measured using 0.1 m^2 (25 by 40 cm) quadrats. 30 quadrat locations were randomly generated by a computer for each transect prior to the initiation of the study (240 per site). These locations were used for all years of the study. The locations of the quadrats started from the end of the transect closest to the exclosure fenceline. Cover was assessed using the following classes and associated midpoints:

$$1 = 0.5$$
 $2 = 2.5$ $3 = 15.0$ $4 = 37.5$ $5 = 62.5$ $6 = 85.0$ $7 = 97.5$

11





Species and associated cover classes for each quadrat were recorded in the field. Sampling was done during the growing season peak, generally late July or early August. Percent cover was determined by averaging the 30 midpoint cover classes for each plant species. Total cover was determined by summing the average percent cover for all of the species in each transect. Percent species composition was determined by dividing average percent cover for each plant species by the total average percent cover and multiplying by 100. Percent frequency for each plant species was determined by dividing the total number of quadrats in which the species occurred by the total number of quadrats for the particular transect, then multiplying by 100 to express as a percentage. The prominence value for each species was determined by multiplying the square root of the percent frequency by percent composition.

D. Productivity

Productivity was measured at the end of each growing season, and was sampled by clipping 10 by 10 cm plots to a one cm height. Ten plots were randomly located within each of the grazed and the ungrazed treatments (trench, work, spoil and off-RoW). Eighty plots were clipped per site. Samples were oven dried for 24 hours at 65 ^oC using a Precision Scientific E Series Oven, Model 18 EM with mechanical ventilation and a sensitivity of +/- 0.25 ^oC. Samples were weighed using a Nexus balance scale with a 0.1 g sensitivity.

E. Cattle Utilization

Production cages, 1 by 1 m in size, were used to measure herbage consumption. There were ten cages per site, five on the trench and five off the RoW. Sample size was increased by subdividing each plot into two 0.25 m^2 plots. Off-RoW cages were 30 m from the edge of the RoW, perpendicular and parallel to the trench cages. A 20 m buffer was established between the end of the permanent line transects and the cages. The first cage on the trench was randomly located by generating a random number between one and five, multiplying it by two and adding it to the 20 m buffer; the remaining four cages were spaced 10 m apart. Cages were not put in the same location more than once throughout the study. At Milo Site 3, there were no production cages. Productivity was assessed by clipping 1 by 1 m plots from within the exclosure, while grazed plots were located adjacent to the exclosure at the same slope position as ungrazed plots. Plots were clipped at the end of the grazing season (usually October) of each year. Samples were oven dried and weighed to the nearest 0.10 grams. Oven drying followed the procedure outlined under productivity above.

F. Statistical Analyses

Analysis of Variance was used to detect significant effects and interactions of production means. Treatment (control, spoil, trench and work area), year, and seeding type were classified as fixed effects while site was classified as a random effect. Interaction between the fixed effects and site was used as the error term for an F-test. Analysis followed convention as outlined in the SPSSx Users Guide. Multiple comparisons of means of significant (0.05 level) effects and interactions were done using an SNK multiple range test (Steel and Torrie 1980). Porcupine and Milo were analysed as individual data sets. Means presented are averages of all sites within each data set. Additional statistical information is presented in Appendix II.

Raw utilization data were purged of zero and extreme data values. Grazed and ungrazed raw data were averaged across site, and the resulting means were used to calculate utilization. This generated a more reliable estimate of utilization than if it had been calculated before averaging.

Changes in cover were evaluated by computing a Dissimilarity Matrix of the year by treatment by grazing interaction for the Porcupine Hills sites (32 cells) and year by treatment by grazing by seed type interaction for the Milo sites (56 cells). Cover was averaged across sites and the averaged file was used to compute the Dissimilarity Matrix. Matrices were calculated using squared Euclidean distances as the measure of dissimilarity (SPSSx Users Guide). Squared Euclidean distances are calculated using the following formula:

Dissimilarity = $(cover i_1 - cover i_2)^2$ Where cover i_1 = cover of species i on treatment 1 cover i_2 = cover of species i on treatment 2 for species i = 1 to 251

With the above formula, a single value is produced (Dissimilarity Index) to compare the vegetation cover of two treatments. Porcupine Hills had 32 data points (4 years by 4 treatments by 2 grazing levels) while Milo had 56 (4 years by 4 treatments by 2 grazing levels by 2 seed sources, which should be 64, but only one set of control data for two seed sources was collected). Dissimilarity Indices were calculated for all possible data point pairs, and a Dissimilarity Matrix was produced. Dissimilarity Matrices were plotted in hyperspace, which is imaginary space where the distance between points is proportional to their dissimilarity (multidimensional scaling algorithms). Two dimensions were sufficient to explain 90% of the variation in all dissimilarity matrices generated. Output from multidimensional scaling was split into individual interactions and plotted for visual comparisons. Distances between points on the resulting graphs are proportional to the dissimilarity index of those points (distance is relative to how similar vegetation cover is).

Cover was analysed as outlined above for vegetation including bare ground and litter cover, and for vegetation alone.

Significant effects for bare ground and litter cover were further analyzed using the same Analyses of Variance models as for the production analyses. Cover values for individual vegetation species were not analyzed statistically, but were graphed for visual interpretation. Graphs of individual species represent means that are averaged across sites and grazing treatments. Site and/or grazing effects were only analysed where there was evidence that there was a reliable effect on vegetation cover, that also differed from trends in vegetation cover found using the means (averaged across site and/or grazing). A reliable effect was defined as a consistent trend in cover over time and space. Kentucky bluegrass was the only species with a site or grazing specific response to the treatments applied. Site or grazing specific cover trends of other species were either represented by averaged means or else the trends were not consistent.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Production

Pipeline construction and reclamation generally resulted in a depression in grass production relative to the control immediately following the disturbance (Table 4). Grass production at the Milo sites increased significantly from 1988 to 1991 on disturbed areas (spoil, trench and work area), equaling or exceeding grass production on the undisturbed control by the fourth year after pipeline construction (Table 4). Grass production on the spoil increased by the greatest magnitude, from 210 to 1600 kg ha⁻¹, in 1988 and 1991, respectively. Grass production trends at the Porcupine Hills sites followed a similar pattern as the Milo sites (Table 4). There were no significant effects or interactions in grass production, although some general trends were apparent. Grass production was lower on disturbed areas one year after pipeline construction. Grass production on all treatments, including the control, increased (insignificantly) from 1988 to 1991.

Forb production response to pipeline construction was opposite to grass production. Most pioneer species in the seed bank are forbs and would therefore be expected to increase with disturbance in the short-term. At the Milo sites, forb production was higher on disturbed areas than on the control (Table 4), peaking on the spoil in 1990 (950 kg ha⁻¹) and on the work area in 1988 (640 kg ha⁻¹). Forb production was consistently higher on the trench than on the control, but not significantly so. Forb production at the Milo sites was variable, with an overall lack of statistical significance. This was affected by the presence or absence of *Artemisia frigida*.

15

Milo	Co	ntro	1	Sp	oil		Tre	ench	l	W	ork		Year M	ean
Grass														
1988	460	а	х	210	а	Ζ	390	а	у	470	а	у	380	У
1989	560	а	х	470	а	Z	720	а	xy	510	а	ý	560	xy
1990	630	а	х	1000	а	у	710	а	xý	980	а	x	830	xy
1991	860	b	x	1600	a	x	900	b	x	1080	b	x	1110	x
Treatment Mean	630	a		820	a		680	a		760	a			
Forb														
1988	90	b	х	100	b	У	270	ab	х	640	а	х	270	х
1989	100	b	х	650	а	x	270	ab	х	130	b	у	280	х
1990	60	b	х	950	а	х	240	b	х	190	b	y	360	х
1991	100	a	x	560	a	x	230	a	x	80	a	y	240	x
Treatment Mean	90	b	~	560	a		250	b		260	b	5	210	~
Total Herbaceous				210				,		1110				
1988	540	ab		310	b	Z	660	ab		1110	а	х	660	х
1989	660	a	Х	1120	а	У	980	a	х	630	а	х	850	Х
1990	700	b	х	1950	а	х	950	b	х	1180	b	х	1190	х
1991	100	а	х	2150	а	х	1130	b	Х	1160	b	х	1350	х
Treatment Mean	960	а		1380	а		930	а		1020	а			
Porcupine Hills	Co	ntro	l	Sp	oil		Tre	ench	l	W	ork		Year M	lean
	Co	ntro	ol	Sp	oil		Tre	ench	l	W	ork		Year M	
Grass				-		v						v		
Grass 1988	1430	a	x	1300	a	X	810	a	x	920	a	x	1120	x
Grass 1988 1989	1430 2030	a a	x x	1300 2670	a a	х	810 1980	a a	x x	920 1940	a a	х	1120 2150	x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990	1430 2030 2040	a a a	x x x	1300 2670 2760	a a a	x x	810 1980 1540	a a a	x x x x	920 1940 2380	a a a	x x	1120 2150 2180	x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991	1430 2030 2040 2540	a a a	x x	1300 2670 2760 2180	a a a a	x	810 1980 1540 1780	a a a	x x	920 1940 2380 2070	a a a a	х	1120 2150	x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990	1430 2030 2040	a a a	x x x	1300 2670 2760	a a a	x x	810 1980 1540	a a a	x x x x	920 1940 2380	a a a	x x	1120 2150 2180	x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010	a a a	x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230	a a a a	x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530	a a a	x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830	a a a a	x x	1120 2150 2180 2140	x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350	a a a	x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350	a a a a	x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770	a a a	x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690	a a a a	x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790	x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010	a a a a	x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230	a a a a	X X X	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330	a a a a	X X X X	920 1940 2380 2070 1830	a a a a	x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140	x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350	a a a a a	x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350	a a a a a	x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770	a a a a a	x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690	a a a a a	x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790	x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390	a a a a a	x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920	a a a a a a	x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330	a a a a a a	x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590	a a a a a a	x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560	x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460	a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430	a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380	a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370	a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410	x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420	a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290	a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640	a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540	a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410	x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Total Herbaceous	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420	a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290 1000	a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640 530	a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540 550	a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410 730	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Total Herbaceous 1988	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290 1000 2650	a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640 530 1580	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540 550 1620	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410 730 1910	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Total Herbaceous 1988 1988 1988 1988 1988 1989	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420 1790 2420	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290 1000 2650 3590	a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640 530 1580 2310	a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540 550 1620 2540	a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410 730 1910 2710	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Total Herbaceous 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420 1790 2420 2500	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290 1000 2650 3590 3190	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640 530 1580 2310 1920	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540 550 1620 2540 2750	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410 730 1910 2710 2590	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean Treatment Mean Total Herbaceous 1988 1989 1988 1988 1989	1430 2030 2040 2540 2010 350 390 460 460 420 1790 2420	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	1300 2670 2760 2180 2230 1350 920 430 1290 1000 2650 3590	a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	810 1980 1540 1780 1530 770 330 380 640 530 1580 2310	a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x	920 1940 2380 2070 1830 690 590 370 540 550 1620 2540	a a a a a a a a a a a a a	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	1120 2150 2180 2140 790 560 410 730 1910 2710	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

Table 4. Grass, forb and total herbaceous production (kg ha⁻¹) means for main effects and two way interactions for the Milo and Porcupine Hills sites.

Means in the same category (ie. grass, forb, total herbaceous), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).

Trends on disturbed areas at the Porcupine Hills sites were not consistent with those of Milo (Table 4). Forb production on all disturbed treatments was greater than on the control in 1988, declined from 1988 to 1990, then increased in 1991. High variability resulted in a lack of significance. However, an overall trend of increased forb production with disturbance was apparent. Forbs will often increase immediately after disturbance as pioneer species become dominant, then decline as those pioneer species are replaced by longer-living members of the plant community. Total herbaceous production at the Milo sites (Table 4) generally increased with time, significantly so on the spoil. This increase is attributed to the increase in grasses, as forbs generally remained stable or declined over time. After four years, production on the spoil was significantly higher than on the other three treatments (2150 kg ha⁻¹). A similar trend was evident at the Porcupine Hills sites (Table 4). Again, total herbaceous production was highest on the spoil, with the other treatments not significantly different. Higher variability at the Porcupine Hills sites resulted in fewer significant differences compared to the Milo sites. The higher production on the spoil at the Milo sites was likely due to the increased number of high biomass species such as western and northern wheatgrass, although there is no indication why these species would be more dominant on the spoil treatment. Bare ground and litter on the spoil was less than on the other disturbed treatments, with live vegetation a higher component of ground cover and contributing to higher production values. The control had a high little club moss cover compared to any of the disturbed treatments, which is low in productivity.

B. Cover

Cover is presented as dissimilarity graphs to show overall trends. To follow these graphs, focus on the quadrant in which the control is located, then view the quadrant location of each disturbed treatment relative to the control. Follow the trend direction by beginning with the shaded symbol.

1. Milo Sites

If litter and bare ground cover are included, areas seeded to native (Figure 3) and non-native (Figure 4) species, particularly trench and spoil areas, trended towards controls (note movement towards the upper right hand quadrant near the control). Work area cover varied. When litter and bare ground were excluded and matrices based on plant cover, disturbed areas were less similar to



Figure 3. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites seeded to native species; bare ground and litter cover are included. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.



Figure 4. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites seeded to non-native species; bare ground and litter cover are included. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.

controls with time (Figures 5 and 6). Work area cover was variable if seeded to non-native species (Figure 6) but consistent if seeded to native species (Figure 5). Thus litter and bare ground cover were becoming more similar to undisturbed controls, but species cover was becoming less similar.

Dissimilarity matrices for on-RoW versus off-RoW varied (Figure 7). When litter and bare ground were included, cover on RoW seeded to native or non-native species became more similar to off-RoW areas. When litter and bare ground were excluded, trends were less apparent. Thus litter and bare ground were moving towards predisturbance levels but species composition was not.

The above general observations are supported by individual analyses of bare ground and litter cover for areas seeded to native (Table 5) and non-native species (Table 6) at the Milo sites. Where native species were seeded, bare ground was significantly higher on all disturbed areas in 1988 and 1989 than on the control, except for the work area in 1988. Litter cover was significantly lower on disturbed areas than on the control in 1988 or 1989 (Table 5). In 1991, there was no significant difference in bare ground between control and disturbed areas; litter cover on the trench significantly exceeded litter cover on the control, spoil and work area. Trends were similar for bare ground and litter cover on areas seeded to non-native species (Table 6). Bare ground was stable on the control throughout the four year study, highest in 1988 or 1989 for disturbed areas, then declining on disturbed areas significantly through to 1991. The main difference between areas seeded to native and non-native species is that in 1991, bare ground was still significantly higher on disturbed areas than on the control for areas seeded to non-native species. Litter trends for areas seeded to non-native and native species were also similar. Litter cover on the spoil and trench was lowest in 1988, increasing significantly by 1991. Litter cover on the work area did not vary significantly over the four years. In 1991, there was significantly higher litter cover on disturbed areas than on the control, likely due to the higher biomass producing nonnative species.

There were trends in dominant species cover for areas seeded to native (Figure 8) and non-native species (Figure 9). Northern wheatgrass, western wheatgrass, pasture sage and needle and thread cover on the control from 1988 to 1991 was more stable than little club moss cover, which was highest in 1988 and lowest in 1991. Little club moss can be mistaken for litter if measured under dry conditions. Its cover was absent or low on the trench and spoil for areas seeded to both native and non-native species. This absence would explain some cover dissimilarity discussed earlier. On the work area, there were large differences in little club moss cover among years, especially in areas seeded to non-native species. Needle and thread cover was reduced on disturbed areas, especially the spoil and trench, compared to the control for areas seeded to both native and non-



Figure 5. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites seeded to native species; bare ground and litter cover are excluded. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.



Figure 6. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites seeded to non-native species; bare ground and litter cover are excluded. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.



Figure 7. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Milo sites seeded to non-native and native species; bare ground and litter cover are (a) included and (b) excluded. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.

	Control	Spoil	Trench	Work	Year Mean
Bare Ground 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	21 b x 40 b x 29 b x 31 a x 31 a	70 a x 74 a x 68 a x 42 a y 63 a	57 a y 77 a x 42 b yz 34 a z 52 a	34 b y 74 a x 41 b y 52 a y 51 a	45 y 66 x 45 y 40 y
Litter 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	48 a x 36 a x 40 bc x 38 b x 40 a	27 b y 25 a y 33 c xy 40 b x 33 a	27 b y 25 a y 60 a x 59 a x 43 a	36 b y 28 a y 51 ab x 47 b x 40 a	35 x 29 x 46 x 47 x

Table 5.Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way interactions for
the Milo sites seeded to native species.

Means in the same category (ie. bare ground, litter), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).

Table 6.	Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way interactions for the Milo
	sites seeded to non-native species.

	Control	Spoil	Trench	Work	Year Mean
Bare Ground 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	15 d x 28 b x 21 b x 25 b x 22 b	83 a x 70 a y 70 a y 48 a z 68 a	64 b xy 74 a x 65 a xy 55 a y 64 a	32 c z 71 a x 24 b y 49 a z 44 a	48 y 61 x 45 x 44 x
Litter 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	47 a x 32 a y 30 a y 27 b y 34 a	18 b y 32 a xy 31 a xy 40 a x 30 a	18 b z 30 a y 35 a xy 46 a x 32 a	41 a x 32 a x 43 a x 46 a x 40 a	31 x 31 x 35 x 39 x

Means in the same category (ie. bare ground, litter), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).



Figure 8. Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at the Milo sites seeded to native species.



Figure 9. Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at the Milo sites seeded to non-native species.

native species. Pasture sage cover was greater on disturbed areas compared to the control for areas seeded to both native and non-native species. It increased most on the trench for three years, then was below 5% by 1991.

Dissimilarity graphs discussed earlier can be explained by western and northern wheatgrass cover. Northern wheatgrass on the trench and spoil increased over time in areas seeded to native and non-native species. Western wheatgrass cover increased on the spoil and trench over time for areas seeded to native species, but not for areas seeded to non-native species. Such cover increase of these dominant species over time could explain the trench and spoil becoming less similar to the control. Cover variability of these species on the work treatment could account for the variability in the dissimilarity matrices discussed previously.

There were no discernible effects of grazing on cover. Grazing disturbed areas resulted in 8 to 10% more bare ground and less litter than in the controls, but the difference was not significant for areas seeded to native or non-native species. Grazed and ungrazed areas were similar in species cover, whether litter and bare ground were included (Figures 3 and 4) or excluded (Figures 5 and 6).

2. Porcupine Hills Sites

Cover at Porcupine Hills sites on disturbed areas evolved towards undisturbed levels whether litter and bare ground were included (Figure 10) or excluded (Figure 11). Disturbed areas were less similar to controls the first year but more similar the fourth year after disturbance. On disturbed areas, bare ground was highest in 1988 and lowest in 1991, while litter was lowest in 1988 and highest in 1991 (Table 7). Both bare ground and litter evolved to predisturbance levels by 1991.

Dissimilarity matrices for on versus off-RoW varied (Figure 12). When litter and bare ground were included, cover on RoW became quite similar to off-RoW areas with time. When litter and bare ground were excluded from cover, trends were still apparent but the movement was not as fast.

Individual species cover varied between disturbed and control treatments (Figure 13). Rough fescue and Idaho fescue cover were reduced by disturbance. Slender wheatgrass was dominant on disturbed areas, but absent in the control. Kentucky bluegrass cover was depressed on the spoil and trench in 1988, but increased through 1991 to levels of the control. Timothy cover was relatively stable except for an increase on the trench in 1989 and 1990. Dissimilarity between disturbed areas and the control can be explained by dissimilarity in slender wheatgrass, Idaho



Figure 10. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for the Porcupine Hills sites; bare ground and litter cover are included. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.


Figure 11. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for the Porcupine Hills sites; bare ground and litter cover are excluded. Begin at the shaded symbol, which represents the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.

(b) Off Right-of-Way Off Right-of-Way 3 3 - Ungrazed - Ungrazed 0---&--Grazed -Ð--Grazed 2 2 1 1 0 Ð 0 0 ର -1 -1 6 -2 - 2 - 3 -3-İ 0 2 3 - 2 Ó 2 3 - 3 1 - 3 -1 -2 1 -1 **Right-of-Way Right-of-Way** 3 3 -Ungrazed - Ungrazed Ð 2 Đ--Grazed 2 -🗗 -- Grazed 1 1 ۲ Э 0 0 ØË -1 -1 1 - 2 - 2 - 3 - 3 1 3 0 2 2 3 1 - 3 -2 0 - 3 - 2 -1 -1 1

(a)

Figure 12. Graphical representation of dissimilarity matrices of cover data for Porcupine Hills sites; bare ground and litter cover are (a) included and (b) excluded. Begin at the shaded symbol, representing the 1988 data, and follow either the dashed or solid line.



Figure 13. Percent cover of dominant species by year and treatment at the Porcupine Hills sites.

	Co	ntro	1	Sp	oil		Tre	ench	1	W	ork		Year	Me	ean
Bare Ground															
1988	9	d	х	50	b	х	67	а	w	38	с	у	2	41	х
1989	7	b	х	38	а	у	48	а	х	40	а	x		33	xy
1990	9	с	х	35	а	у	34	a	у	21	b	z		25	v
1991	5	а	х	11	а	Z	17	а	Z	16	а	z		12	z
Treatment Mean	7	b		34	а		41	а		29	а				
Litter															
1988	80	а	х	34	b	у	5	с	у	49	а	у	2	42	z
1989	85	а	х	55	b	xy	43	b	X	61	ab	xy	(51	y
1990	81	а	х	55	а	xy	56	а	x	73	а	xy	e	56	y
1991	77	а	х	82	а	x	73	а	х	83	а	x		79	x
Treatment Mean	81	а		57	bc		44	c		67	b				

Table 7. Percent cover of bare ground and litter for main effects and two way interactions for the Porcupine Hills sites.

Means in the same category (ie. bare ground, litter), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).

fescue and rough fescue. The tendency for disturbed areas to be more similar to the control over time can be explained by the increase in Kentucky bluegrass on the spoil and trench over time.

Cover on grazed and ungrazed controls were less similar with time (Figure 11), due to declines in timothy and Kentucky bluegrass in ungrazed controls, while cover was constant in grazed controls. Native species remained constant in grazed and ungrazed treatments, or, as for rough fescue, increased uniformly in both treatments (Figure 13). On disturbed areas (trench, spoil, work area), grazing had little effect on cover. Where Kentucky bluegrass was dominant or co-dominant (Cyr, Davies, Rowland) in the control, cover was depressed initially by disturbance, but quickly re-established predisturbance levels and was not affected by grazing. Where it was not dominant or co-dominant on the control (Waldron), it was introduced with disturbance and became dominant but was inhibited by grazing. The ratio of non-native to total cover off-RoW and on trench was higher if grazed than ungrazed; on the spoil and work areas it was similar with treatment (Figure 14). This ratio was not plotted for Milo sites since introduced species cover values were very low.

32



Figure 14. Ratio of non-native versus total cover at the Porcupine Hills sites.

C. Utilization

There was no significant difference in utilization between the trench and control at either the Milo or Porcupine Hills sites (Table 8). Trends were strong for higher utilization on the trench at both sites, but high variability limited significance. Grass utilization was consistent across years for both sites; forb utilization was not. Negative utilization may result from inherent variability in local vegetation, the inside/outside utilization method and random cage placement. These factors give higher grazed than ungrazed estimates and negative utilization values. Inconsistent forb utilization may lead to inconsistent total herbaceous utilization as well.

D. Seeded Versus Unseeded Treatments

Seeding versus no seeding had an effect on production, cover and individual species cover. Grass production was higher in the unseeded areas, forb production was higher in the seeded areas (with the exception of 1989), and total herbaceous production was higher in the unseeded areas in all three years (Table 9). Grass production increased steadily with time in both seeded and unseeded areas. Forbs and total herbaceous production increased by 1990 and then decreased by 1991. This is likely due to the increase in pioneer forb species in the early stages of succession after disturbance. More forbs would be expected initially in unseeded areas, where there is less competition from seeded grasses. However, the larger production values of grasses in the unseeded areas is difficult to explain.

Percent cover of total vegetation and litter increased with time from 1988 to 1991 in both the seeded and unseeded areas, whereas bare ground decreased during this time period (Figure 15). By 1991, total vegetation and litter cover was higher and bare ground was lower in the unseeded areas than in the seeded areas.

Individual species cover was also affected by seeding versus no seeding (Figure 16); only species with greater than 5% cover were assessed. Western wheatgrass cover was higher in the unseeded than the seeded areas. Northern wheatgrass cover was higher in the seeded areas than in the unseeded areas. Pasture sage decreased by 1991 in the seeded areas but increased in the unseeded areas; spear leaved goosefoot followed the opposite trend. Scarlet mallow was slightly higher in seeded areas than in unseeded areas. Buckbrush was only present in the unseeded areas, accounting for the larger forb production values in this area. Thus the seeded areas were dominated by northern wheatgrass and pasture sage; the unseeded areas were dominated by western wheatgrass and pasture sage.

Milo	Control	Trench	Year Mean
Grass 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	44 33 47 41 a	59 64 51 58 a	51 x 48 x 49 x
Forb 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	33 -15 29 16 a	39 45 16 33 a	36 x 15 x 22 x
Total Herbaceous 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	42 29 46 39 a	43 51 31 42 a	42 x 40 x 39 x
Porcupine Hills	Control	Trench	Year Mean
Grass 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	39 54 12 42	81 90 50 70	60 x 70 x 31 x 56 x
1 routinoint ivroun	37 a	72 a	
Forb 1988 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	37 a 43 39 26 46 38 a	72 a 70 42 -9 63 41 a	56 x 40 x 8 y 54 x

Table 8.Grass, forb and total herbaceous percent utilization for main effects and two way
interactions for the Milo and Porcupine Hills sites.

Means in the same category (ie. grass, forb, total herbaceous), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).



Figure 15. Percent cover of total vegetation, litter and bare ground in seeded and unseeded areas at Milo Site 4.





	Seede	ed	Unsee	eded	Year	Mean
Grass 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	50 250 560 290	ax bx bx b	230 1410 2110 1250	ay ax ax a	140 830 1340	y x x
Forb 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	490 2190 400 1030	a	1100 1240 190 840	a	800 1710 300	y x y
Total Herbaceous 1989 1990 1991 Treatment Mean	550 2430 960 1310	Ъ	1330 2650 2300 2090	а	940 2540 1630	y x y

Table 9.Total grass, forb and herbaceous production (kg ha-1) for main effects and two way
interaction at Milo Site 4.

Means in the same category (ie. grass, forb, total herbaceous), for each column (xyz) and row (abc) that have the same letter, are not significantly different (P < 0.05).

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Pipeline construction and subsequent reclamation affected vegetation production:

- 1. Grass production decreased within the first year following disturbance as was expected; as time progressed grass production increased and, at the Milo sites, often exceeded predisturbance levels.
- 2. Forb production increased within the first year following the disturbance; forb production on disturbed treatments generally remained higher than that on the control as time progressed.
- 3. Total herbaceous production generally increased with time on all disturbed treatments at the Milo sites, despite significant decreases with time in the undisturbed areas; the trend was similar but less striking at the Porcupine Hills sites, perhaps due to the more consistent precipitation. These total herbaceous production increases were due to increased grass production.
- 4. Changes in total production were most dramatic on the spoil treatment.
- 5. Grass production was higher on unseeded areas than on seeded areas.

Pipeline construction and subsequent reclamation affected site ground cover:

- 1. Bare ground increased immediately after disturbance as expected, then decreased after two years relative to the control. Within four years, there were no significant differences between disturbed areas seeded to native species and undisturbed controls. This trend was similar to areas seeded with non-native species, but bare ground was still significantly higher in disturbed areas compared to undisturbed areas at the end of four years.
- 2. Litter decreased after disturbance then increased within three years. After four years, in areas seeded to native species, litter on the trench was higher than that in the control. In areas seeded with non-native species, litter was higher in all disturbed treatments than in the control.
- 3. At the Milo sites, species composition of disturbed areas generally moved further away from predisturbed conditions with time. This was most notable for the areas seeded to non-native species. Those areas seeded to native species became more stable with time. Much of this dissimilarity was due to the lack of little club moss on the disturbed sites. Needle and thread grass tended to decrease the most on the spoil and trench. Pasture sage was greater on the disturbed treatments than on the control, but within four years was decreasing. Northern and western wheatgrasses tended to increase with time in disturbed areas seeded to native species, explaining the major differences in the disturbed and undisturbed areas.
- 4. At the Porcupine Hills sites, cover on disturbed areas moved towards undisturbed conditions within four years. Dissimilarities were explained by increases in Kentucky bluegrass on disturbed areas, even after four years.
- 5. There was no discernible effect of grazing on cover. When Kentucky bluegrass was dominant or co-dominant in undisturbed areas, grazing did not affect its re-establishment. Where it was not a dominant or co-dominant prior to disturbance, it tended to become dominant with disturbance. Only at the Waldron site, was Kentucky bluegrass establishment inhibited by grazing.

Pipeline construction and subsequent reclamation affected utilization:

- 1. There were strong but highly variable trends for higher overall utilization on the trench than in undisturbed areas at all sites.
- 2. Grass utilization was consistent across sites, forb utilization was not, likely due to the unpalatable nature of some of the forbs.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Can-Ag Enterprises Ltd. 1988. Porcupine Hills Lateral revegetation test plot soil inventory. Prepared for NOVA an Alberta Corporation.
- Can-Ag Enterprises Ltd. 1988. Milo Lateral revegetation test plot soil inventory. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1987. Milo proposal revegetation research data report. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1988. Milo proposal revegetation research data report. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1989. Milo proposal revegetation research data report. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1990. Milo proposal revegetation research data report. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1991. Milo proposal revegetation research data report. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1987. Vegetation study on the Porcupine Hills Line. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1988. Vegetation study on the Porcupine Hills Line. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1989. Vegetation study on the Porcupine Hills Line. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1990. Vegetation study on the Porcupine Hills Line. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Eastern Slopes Rangelands Consultants. 1991. Vegetation study on the Porcupine Hills Line. Prepared for NOVA Corporation of Alberta.
- Steel, R. G. D. and J. H. Torrie. 1980. Principles and procedures of statistics. McGraw Hill Book Co., New York.
- Strong, W. L. 1992. Ecoregions and ecodistricts of Alberta. Volume 1. Prepared for Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. Land Information Services Division. Resource Information Branch.

VII. APPENDICES

Appendix I: Species List For The Study Sites

A. Milo Sites

el constituir e const

Site	Scientific Name	Common Name
1	Agropyron albicans	Wheatgrass
1	Agropyron dasystachyum	Northern wheatgrass
1	Agropyron pectiniforme	Crested wheatgrass
1	Agropyron smithii	Western wheatgrass
1	Agropyron subsecundum	Awned wheatgrass
1	Agropyron trachycaulum	Slender wheatgrass
1	Bouteloua gracilis	Blue grama
1	Calamagrostis montanensis	Reed grass
1	Elymus junceus	Wild rye
1	Hordeum jubatum	Foxtail barley
1	Koeleria macrantha	June grass
1	Muhlenbergia richardsonis	Mat muhly
1	Poa canbyi	Canby bluegrass
1	Poa compressa	Canada bluegrass
1	Poa sandbergii	Sandberg bluegrass
1	Stipa comata	Needle and thread
1	Stipa curtiseta	Western porcupine grass
1	Stipa viridula	Green needlegrass
1	Carex obtusata	Sedge
1	Carex pensylvanica	Sedge
1	Carex sp.	Sedge
1	Carex stenophylla	Sedge
1	Achillea millefolium	Yarrow
1	Amaranthus albus	Tumbleweed
1	Androsace septentrionalis	Fairy candelabra
1	Antennaria aprica	Pussy toes
1	Antennaria parvifolia	Pussy toes
1	Arnica sp.	Amica
1	Artemisia cana	Sagebrush
1	Artemisia frigida	Pasture sage
1	Artemisia ludoviciana	Prairie sagewort
1	Aster ericoides	Tufted white prairie aster
1	Aster falcatus	Creeping white prairie aster
1	Aster sp.	Aster
1	Astragalus sp.	Milk vetch
1	Betula glandulosa	Bog dwarf birch
1	Chenopodium album	Lamb's quarters

41

1	Comandra umbellata	Bastard
1	Descurainia sophia	Tansy 1
1	Erysimum inconspicuum	Small f
1	Eurotia lanata	Winter
1	Gaura coccinea	Scarlet
1	Grindella squarrosa	Gum w
1	Gutierrezia sarothrae	Broom
1	Heterotheca villosa	Hairy g
1	Lappula occidentalis	Blue bu
1	Lappula squarrosa	Blue bu
1	Medicago sativa	Alfalfa
1	Monolepis nuttalliana	Spear-l
1	Opuntia fragilis	Prickly
1	Penstemon procerus	Slender
1	Phlox hoodii	Hood's
1		Commo
1	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	
	Potentilla hippiana	Cinque
1	Salsola kali	Russian
1	Selaginella densa	Little c
1	Sisymbrium altissimum	Tumbli
1	Solanum triflorum	Wild to
1	Solidago missouriensis	Missou
1	Solidago spathulata	Golden
1	Sphaeralcea coccinea	Scarlet
1	Symphoricarpos albus	Buckbr
1	Taraxacum officinale	Commo
1	Thalictrum venulosum	Veiny 1
1	Thermopsis rhombifolia	Golden
2	Agropyron albicans	Wheatg
2	Agropyron dasystachyum	Norther
2	Agropyron pectiniforme	Crested
2	Agropyron smithii	Western
2	Agropyron trachycaulum	Slender
2	Bouteloua gracilis	Blue gr
2	Calamagrostis montanensis	Reed g
2	Elymus junceus	Wild ry
2	Hordeum jubatum	Foxtail
2	Koeleria macrantha	June gr
2	Muhlenbergia richardsonis	Mat mu
2	Poa canbyi	Canby
2	Poa jucifolia	Alkalit
2	Poa sandbergii	Sandbe
2	Puccinellia nuttalliana	Nuttall
2	Schedonnardus paniculatus	Tumble
2	Stipa comata	Needle
<i>-</i> .	supa comuna	1,00010

d toadflax mustard flowered rocket r fat t butterfly weed weed n snakeweed golden aster uπ uп leaved goosefoot y pear cactus r blue beard-tongue phlox on knotweed efoil n thistle club moss ing mustard omato uri goldenrod nrod mallow rush on dandelion meadow rue n bean

grass ern wheatgrass d wheatgrass rn wheatgrass r wheatgrass rama grass ye barley rass uhly bluegrass bluegrass erg bluegrass l's alkali grass le grass and thread

2	Stipa viridula	Green needlegrass
2	Carex obtusata	Sedge
2	Carex pensylvanica	Sedge
2	Carex sp.	Sedge
2	Carex stenophylla	Sedge
2	Achillea millefolium	Yarrow
2	Allium cernumm	Nodding onion
2	Amaranthus albus	Tumbleweed
2	Androsace septentrionalis	Fairy candelabra
2	Antennaria aprica	Pussy toes
2	Antennaria parvifolia	Pussy toes
2	Artemisia campestris	Sage
2	Artemisia cana	Sagebrush
2	Artemisia frigida	Pasture sage
2	Artemisia ludoviciana	Prairie sagewort
2	Aster falcatus	Creeping white prairie aster
2	Aster sp.	Aster
2	Astragalus cicer	Cicer mild vetch
2	Astragalus sp.	Milk vetch
2	Atriplex nuttallii	Salt sage
2	Campanula rotundifolia	Hair bluebell
2	Chenopodium album	Lamb's quarters
2	Coryphantha vivipara	Ball cactus
2	Descurainia sophia	Tansy mustard
2	Erysimum inconspicuum	Small flowered rocket
2	Gaura coccinea	Scarlet butterfly weed
2	Grindella squarrosa	Gum weed
2	Gutierrezia sarothrae	Broom snakeweed
2	Hackelia sp.	Stick seed
2	Lappula occidentalis	Blue burr
2	Lappula squarrosa	Blue burr
2	Lepidium sp.	Peppergrass
2	Medicago sativa	Alfalfa
2	Monolepis nuttalliana	Spear-leaved goosefoot
2	Opuntia fragilis	Prickly pear cactus
2	Penstemon sp.	Beard-tongue
2	Phlox hoodii	Hood's phlox
2	Plantago sp.	Plantain
2	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	Common knotweed
2	Potentilla arguta	White cinquefoil
2	Potentilla hippiana	Cinquefoil
2	Potentilla pensylvanica	Cinquefoil
2	Salsola kali	Russian thistle
2	Selaginella densa	Little club moss
2	Sisymbrium altissimum	Tumbling mustard
2	Solanum triflorum	Wild tomato

Contraction of the second
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Solidago missouriensis Solidago spathulata Sphaeralcea coccinea Taraxacum officinale Thalictrum venulosum Thermopsis rhombifolia Zizia aptera	Missouri goldenrod Goldenrod Scarlet mallow Common dandelion Veiny meadow rue Golden bean Meadow parsnip
3	Agropyron dasystachyum	Northern wheatgrass
3	Agropyron pectiniforme	Crested wheatgrass
3	Agropyron smithii	Western wheatgrass
3	Agropyron subsecundum	Awned wheatgrass
3	Agropyron trachycaulum	Slender wheatgrass
3	Bouteloua gracilis	Blue grama
3	Calamagrostis montanensis	Reed grass
3	Hordeum jubatum	Foxtail barley
3	Koeleria macrantha	June grass
3	Muhlenbergia richardsonis	Mat muhly
3	Poa canbyi	Canby bluegrass
3	Poa compressa	Canada bluegrass
3	Poa sandbergii	Sandberg bluegrass
3	Stipa comata	Needle and thread
3	Stipa curtiseta	Western porcupine grass
3	Stipa richardsonii	Richardson needlegrass
3	Stipa viridula	Green needlegrass
3	Carex obtusata	Sedge
3	Carex pensylvanica	Sedge
3	Carex sp.	Sedge
3	Carex stenophylla	Sedge
3	Achillea millefolium	Yarrow
3	Androsace septentrionalis	Fairy candelabra
3	Anemone patens	Prairie crocus
3	Antennaria parvifolia	Pussy toes
3	Artemisia frigida	Pasture sage
3	Artemisia ludoviciana	Prairie sagewort
3	Aster ericoides	Tufted white prairie aster
3	Aster falcatus	Creeping white prairie aster
3	Astragalus cicer	Cicer mild vetch
3	Astragalus sp.	Milk vetch
3	Chenopodium album	Lamb's quarters
3	Cirsium arvense	Canada thistle
3	Cirsium flodmanni	Flodman's thistle
3	Cirsium undulatum	Thistle
3	Comandra umbellata	Bastard toadflax
3	Coryphantha vivipara	Ball cactus
3	Descurainia sophia	Tansy mustard

3	Elaeagnus commutata	Silver berry
3	Erysimum inconspicuum	Small flowered rocket
3	Gaillardia aristata	Gaillardia
3	Gaura coccinea	Scarlet butterfly weed
3		Gum weed
3	Grindella squarrosa	
	Haplopappus spinulosus	Haplopappus
3	Heterotheca villosa	Hairy golden aster
3	Lappula occidentalis	Blue burr
3	Lappula squarrosa	Blue burr
3	Lepidium sp.	Peppergrass
3	Liatris punctata	Blazing star
3	Lygodesmia juncea	Skeleton weed
3	Medicago sativa	Alfalfa
3	Melilotus sp.	Sweet clover
3	Minuartia rubella	Sandwort
3	Orthocarpus luteus	Owl clover
3	Phlox hoodii	Hood's phlox
3	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	Common knotweed
3	Polygonum douglasii	Knotweed
3	Potentilla gracilis	Graceful cinquefoil
3	Rosa arkansana	Prairie rose
3	Salsola kali	Russian thistle
3	Selaginella densa	Little club moss
3	Sisymbrium altissimum	Tumbling mustard
3	Solidago missouriensis	Missouri goldenrod
3	Solidago sp.	Goldenrod
3	Sphaeralcea coccinea	Scarlet mallow
3	Thalictrum venulosum	Veiny meadow rue
3	Thermopsis rhombifolia	Golden bean
3	Vicia sparsifolia	Wild vetch
3	Zigadenus venenosus	Death camas
	5	
4	Agropyron dasystachyum	Northern wheatgrass
4	Agropyron glaucum	Wheatgrass
4	Agropyron smithii	Western wheatgrass
4	Agropyron trachycaulum	Slender wheatgrass
4	Agrostis scabra	Hairgrass
4	Bouteloua gracilis	Blue grama
4	Calamagrostis montanensis	Reed grass
4	Helictotrichon hookeri	Hooker's oat grass
4	Hordeum jubatum	Foxtail barley
4	Koeleria macrantha	June grass
4	Muhlenbergia richardsonis	Mat muhly
4	Poa sandbergii	Sandberg bluegrass
4	Poa sp.	Bluegrass
4	Stipa comata	Needle and thread
т	Supa comuna	

Super-spectra (Statistics)

4	Stipa curtiseta	West
4	Stipa viridula	Gree
4	Carex pennsylvanica	Sedg
4	Carex sp.	Sedg
4	Carex stenophylla	Sedg
4	Achillea millefolium	Үап
4	Amaranthus albus	Tum
4	Androsace septentrionalis	Fairy
4	Anemone patens	Prair
4	Antennaria parvifolia	Puss
4	Artemisia frigida	Pasti
4	Artemisia ludoviciana	Prair
4	Aster falcatus	Cree
4	Astragalus pectinatus	Narr
4	Astragalus sp.	Milk
4	Chenopodium album	Lam
4	Descurainia sophia	Tans
4	Eurotia lanata	Wint
4	Gaura coccinea	Scar
4	Haplopappus spinulosus	Hapl
4	Heterotheca villosa	Hair
4	Liatris punctata	Blaz
4	Lygodesmia juncea	Skel
4	Monolepis nuttalliana	Spea
4	Phlox hoodii	Hoo
4	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	Com
4	Polygonum sp.	Knot
4	Potentilla pensylvanica	Cinq
4	Rosa arkansana	Prair
4	Salsola kali	Russ
4	Selaginella densa	Little
4	Solanum triflorum	Wild
4	Solidago missouriensis	Miss
4	Sonchus sp.	Sow
4	Sphaeralcea coccinea	Scarl
4	Symphoricarpos occidentalis	Buck
4	Thalictrum venulosum	Vein
4	Thermopsis rhombifolia	Gold
4	Vicia americana	Wild
4	Vicia sparsifolia	Wild
4	Viola sp.	Early
	•	•

stern porcupine grass en needlegrass ge ge ge row nbleweed y candelabra rie crocus sy toes ure sage rie sagewort eping white prairie aster row-leafed milk vetch c vetch nb's quarters sy mustard ter fat rlet butterfly weed lopappus ry golden aster zing star leton weed ar-leaved goosefoot d's phlox nmon knotweed tweed quefoil rie rose sian thistle le club moss d tomato souri goldenrod thistle let mallow kbrush ny meadow rue den bean d vetch d vetch ly blue velvet

B. Porcupine Hills Sites

Site	Scientific Name	Common Name
Cyr	Agropyron dasystachyum	Northern wheatgrass
Суг	Agropyron glaucum	Wheatgrass
Cyr	Agropyron smithii	Western wheatgrass
Cyr	Agropyron subsecundum	Awned wheatgrass
Cyr	Agropyron trachycaulum	Slender wheatgrass
Cyr	Agrostis scabra	Hairgrass
Cyr	Bromus carinatus	Mountain brome
Cyr	Bromus inermis	Smooth brome
Cyr	Bromus pumpellianus	Northern awnless brome
Cyr	Calamagrostis montanensis	Reed grass
Cyr	Danthonia californica	Oat grass
Cyr	Danthonia parryi	Parry oat grass
Cyr	Festuca idahoensis	Bluebunch fescue
Cyr	Festuca rubra	Creeping red fescue
Cyr	Festuca scabrella	Rough fescue
Cyr	Helictotrichon hookeri	Hooker's oat grass
Cyr	Hierochloe odorata	Sweetgrass
Cyr	Hordeum jubatum	Foxtail barley
Cyr	Koeleria macrantha	June grass
Cyr	Phleum pratense	Timothy
Cyr	Poa alpina	Alpine blue grass
Cyr	Poa canbyi	Canby bluegrass
Cyr	Poa compressa	Canada bluegrass
Cyr	Poa cusickii	Cusick bluegrass
Cyr	Poa interior	Wood bluegrass
Cyr	Poa pratensis	Kentucky bluegrass
Cyr	Stipa columbiana	Columbian needlegrass
Cyr	Stipa curtiseta	Western porcupine grass
Cyr	Stipa viridula	Green needlegrass
Cyr	Carex praticola	Sedge
Cyr	Carex rossii	Sedge
Cyr	Carex siccata	Sedge
Cyr	Carex atrosquama	Sedge
Cyr	Carex obtusata	Sedge
Cyr	Carex pensylvanica	Sedge
Cyr	Carex scirpoidea	Sedge
Cyr	Carex stenophylla	Sedge
Cyr	Juncus balticus	Wire rush
Cyr	Achillea millefolium	Yarrow
Cyr	Allium cernuum	Nodding onion
Cyr	Androsace septentrionalis	Fairy candelabra

Cyr	Anemone multifida	Cut-leaved anemone
Cyr	Anemone patens	Prairie crocus
Cyr	Antennaria aprica	Pussy toes
Cyr	Antennaria parvifolia	Pussy toes
Cyr	Antennaria rosea	Pussy toes
Cyr	Aster laevis	Smooth aster
Суг	Atriplex nuttallii	Salt sage
Cyr	Campanula rotundifolia	Hair bluebell
Cyr	Cerastium arvense	Mouse-ear chickweed
Cyr	Cirsium arvense	Canada thistle
Cyr	Comandra umbellata	Bastard toadflax
Cyr	Erigeron caespitosus	Fleabane
Cyr	Fragaria virginiana	Wild strawberry
Cyr	Gaillardia aristata	Gaillardia
•	Galium boreale	Northern bedstraw
Cyr	Gentianella amarella	Felwort
Cyr	Geranium richardsonii	
Cyr	Geranium viscosissimum	Wild geranium
Cyr		Sticky purple geranium Northern sweet broom
Cyr	Hedysarum alpinum	Yellow sweetbroom
Cyr	Hedysarum sulphurescens	Blue burr
Cyr	Lappula occidentalis	
Суг	Lithospermum ruderale	Puccoon
Cyr	Lomatium triternatum	Prairie parsley
Cyr	Lupinus sericeus	Perennial lupine
Cyr	Monolepis nuttalliana	Spear-leaved goosefoot
Cyr	Oxytropis monticola	Late yellow locoweed
Cyr	Penstemon confertus	Yellow beard-tongue
Cyr	Penstemon sp.	Beard-tongue
Cyr	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	Common knotweed
Cyr	Polygonum bistortoides	Bistort
Cyr	Potentilla arguta	White cinquefoil
Cyr	Potentilla fruticosa	Shrubby cinquefoil
Cyr	Potentilla gracilis	Graceful cinquefoil
Cyr	Potentilla norvegica	Cinquefoil
Cyr	Ranunculus cardiophyllus	Heart-leaved buttercup
Cyr	Rosa acicularis	Prickly rose
Cyr	Rosa arkansana	Prairie rose
Cyr	Rosa sp.	Rose
Cyr	Rumex triangulivalis	Narrow-leaved dock
Cyr	Selaginella densa	Little club moss
Cyr	Senecio pauperculus	Ragwort
Cyr	Senecio sp.	Ragwort
Cyr	Sisyrinchium montanum	Blue-eyed grass
Cyr	Smilacina stellata	Star-flowered Solomon's-seal
Cyr	Solanum triflorum	Wild tomato

- Although

Cyr	Solidago missouriensis
Cyr	Solidago spathulata
Cyr	Solidago sp.
Cyr	Taraxacum officinale
Cyr	Thalictrum venulosum
Cyr	Thermopsis rhombifolia
Cyr	Thlaspi arvense
Cyr	Trifolium repens
Cyr	Vicia americana
Davies	Agropyron dasystachyum
Davies	Agropyron glaucum
Davies	Agropyron subsecundum
Davies	Agropyron trachycaulum
Davies	Bromus carinatus
Davies	Bromus inermis
Davies	Bromus pumpellianus
Davies	Dactyllis glomerata
Davies	Danthonia californica
Davies	Festuca idahoensis
Davies	Festuca rubra
Davies	Festuca scabrella
Davies	Hordeum jubatum
Davies	Koeleria macrantha
Davies	Muhlenbergia richardsonis
Davies	Phleum pratense
Davies	Poa compressa
Davies	Poa interior
Davies	Poa jucifolia
Davies	Poa pratensis
Davies	Stipa comata
Davies	Carex atrosquama
Davies	Carex eleocharis
Davies	Carex pensylvanica
Davies	Carex rossii
Davies	Carex scirpoidea
Davies	Carex siccata
Davies	Carex stenophylla
Davies	Juncus balticus
Davies	Achillea millefolium
Davies	Agoseris glauca
Davies	Androsace septentrionalis
Davies	Aquilegia sp.
Davies	Arabis drummondii
Davies	Aster laevis

Missouri goldenrod Goldenrod Goldenrod Common dandelion Veiny meadow rue Golden bean Stinkweed White Dutch clover Wild vetch Northern wheatgrass Wheatgrass Awned wheatgrass Slender wheatgrass Mountain brome Smooth brome Northern awnless brome Orchard grass Oat grass Bluebunch fescue Creeping red fescue Rough fescue Foxtail barley June grass Mat muhly Timothy Canada bluegrass Wood bluegrass Alkali bluegrass Kentucky bluegrass Needle and thread Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Wire rush Yarrow False dandelion Fairy candelabra Columbine Rock cress Smooth aster

Davies	Aster sp.	Aster
Davies	Astragalus cicer	Cicer n
Davies	Campanula rotundifolia	Hair blu
Davies	Capsella bursa-pastoris	Shephe
Davies	Cerastium arvense	Mouse-
Davies	Chenopodium album	Lamb's
Davies	Cirsium arvense	Canada
Davies	Descurainia sophia	Tansy 1
Davies	Fragaria virginiana	Wild st
Davies	Galium boreale	Norther
Davies	Geranium richardsonii	Geraniı
Davies	Geranium viscosissimum	Sticky j
Davies	Geum aleppicum	Yellow
Davies	Geum macrophyllum	Yellow
Davies	Geum triflorum	Three-f
Davies	Lathyrus ochroleucus	Pea vin
Davies	Lomatium triternatum	Prairie
Davies	Medicago lupulina	Black n
Davies	Medicago sativa	Alfalfa
Davies	Penstemon confertus	Yellow
Davies	Perideridia gairdneri	Squaw
Davies	Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)	Commo
Davies	Potentilla fruticosa	Shrubb
Davies	Potentilla gracilis	Gracefi
Davies	Potentilla norvegica	Cinque
Davies	Potentilla pensylvanica	Cinque
Davies	Potentilla rivularis	Cinque
Davies	Rosa acicularis	Prickly
Davies	Rosa arkansana	Prairie
Davies	Rosa woodsii	Commo
Davies	Rubus idaeus	Wild re
Davies	Silene pratensis	White c
Davies	Sisyrinchium montanum	Blue-ey
Davies	Taraxacum officinale	Commo
Davies	Thalictrum venulosum	Veiny r
Davies	Thlaspi arvense	Stinkw
Davies	Trifolium hybridum	Alsike
Davies	Trifolium repens	White I
Davies	Vicia americana	Wild ve
Davies	Viola adunca	Early b
Rowland	Agropyron dasystachyum	Norther
Rowland	Agropyron glaucum	Wheatg
Rowland	Agropyron smithii	Wester
Rowland	Agropyron subsecundum	Awned

mild vetch luebell erd's purse e-ear chickweed s quarters a thistle mustard trawberry ern bedstraw ium purple geranium v avens v avens flowered avens ne parsley medic v beard-tongue root on knotweed oy cinquefoil ful cinquefoil efoil efoil efoil rose rose ion wild rose ed raspberry cockle yed grass on dandelion meadow rue veed clover Dutch clover retch olue velvet

Northern wheatgrass Wheatgrass Western wheatgrass Awned wheatgrass Rowland Agropyron trachycaulum Rowland Bromus inermis Rowland Bromus pumpellianus Calamagrostis montanensis Rowland Rowland Danthonia parryi Rowland Festuca idahoensis Rowland Festuca rubra Rowland Festuca saximontana Rowland Festuca scabrella Rowland Helictotrichon hookeri Rowland Hordeum jubatum Rowland Koeleria macrantha Rowland Muhlenbergia richardsonis Rowland Phleum pratense Rowland Poa compressa Rowland Poa interior Rowland Poa pratensis Rowland Poa sp. Rowland Stipa columbiana Stipa curtiseta Rowland Stipa richardsonii Rowland Rowland Stipa viridula Rowland Carex obtusata Rowland Carex pensylvanica Rowland Carex scirpoidea Rowland Carex siccata Rowland Carex stenophylla Rowland Achillea millefolium Rowland Agoseris glauca Rowland Allium cernumm Rowland Androsace septentrionalis Rowland Anemone cylindrica Rowland Anemone multifida Rowland Anemone patens Rowland Antennaria neglecta Rowland Antennaria nitida (parvifolia) Rowland Antennaria parvifolia Rowland Antennaria rosea Rowland Arctostaphylos uva-ursi Artemisia frigida Rowland Aster laevis Rowland Astragalus cicer Rowland Rowland Astragalus sp. Rowland Campanula rotundifolia Rowland Capsella bursa-pastoris

Slender wheatgrass Smooth brome Northern awnless brome Reed grass Parry oat grass Bluebunch fescue Creeping red fescue Sheep fescue Rough fescue Hooker's oat grass Foxtail barley June grass Mat muhly Timothy Canada bluegrass Wood bluegrass Kentucky bluegrass Bluegrass Columbian needlegrass Western porcupine grass Richardson needlegrass Green needlegrass Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Yarrow False dandelion Nodding onion Fairy candelabra Long-fruited anemone Cut-leaved anemone Prairie crocus Pussy-toes Pussy toes Pussy toes Pussy toes Common bearberry Pasture sage Smooth aster Cicer mild vetch Milk vetch Hair bluebell Shepherd's purse

Rowland Cerastium arvense Rowland Chenopodium album Rowland Cirsium arvense Rowland Cirsium flodmanni Comandra umbellata Rowland Rowland Cynoglossum officinale Rowland Descurainia sophia Rowland Erigeron glabellus Rowland Erysimum inconspicuum Rowland Fragaria virginiana Rowland Gaillardia aristata Galium boreale Rowland Rowland Gentianella amarella Rowland Geum triflorum Rowland Hackelia americana Rowland Hedysarum alpinum Heuchera spp. Rowland Rowland Juniperus horizontalis Rowland Lappula occidentalis Rowland Lappula squarrosa Rowland Lathyrus ochroleucus Rowland Linum lewisii Rowland Lithospermum ruderale Rowland Monarda fistulosa Rowland Monolepis nuttalliana Rowland Oxytropis deflexa Rowland Oxytropis monticola Rowland Oxytropis splendens Rowland Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare) Rowland Populus tremuloides Rowland Potentilla arguta Rowland Potentilla fruticosa Rowland Potentilla hippiana Rowland Potentilla pensylvanica Rowland Potentilla rivularis Rosa acicularis Rowland Rosa arkansana Rowland Rowland Salix pseudomonticola Rowland Salix sp. Selaginella densa Rowland Rowland Senecio canus Rowland Shepherdia canadensis Rowland Sisyrinchium montanum Smilacina stellata Rowland Rowland Soncus sp.

Mouse-ear chickweed Lamb's quarters Canada thistle Flodman's thistle Bastard toadflax Hound's tongue Tansy mustard Fleabane Small flowered rocket Wild strawberry Gaillardia Northern bedstraw Felwort Three-flowered avens Stick-seed Northern sweetbroom Alum root Creeping juniper Blue burr Blue burr Pea vine Wild blue flax Puccoon Horse mint Spear-leaved goosefoot Reflexed locoweed Late yellow locoweed Showy locoweed Common knotweed Trembling aspen White cinquefoil Shrubby cinquefoil Cinquefoil Cinquefoil Cinquefoil Prickly rose Prairie rose Willow Willow Little club moss Prairie groundsel Canadian buffalo berry Blue-eyed grass Star-flowered Solomon's seal Sow thistle

Rowland Taraxacum officinale Rowland Thalictrum venulosum Rowland Thermopsis rhombifolia Trifolium repens Rowland Rowland Vicia americana Rowland Vicia sparsifolia Viola adunca Rowland Rowland Viola sp. Rowland Zigadenus elegans Rowland Zizia aptera Rowland Zizia aptera Waldron Agropyron albicans Agropyron dasystachyum Waldron Waldron Agropyron glaucum Waldron Agropyron pectiniforme Waldron Agropyron smithii Waldron Agropyron subsecundum Waldron Agropyron trachycaulum Waldron Agrostis scabra Waldron Bromus inermis Waldron Bromus pumpellianus Bouteloua gracilis Waldron Waldron Calamagrostis montanensis Festuca idahoensis Waldron Waldron Festuca rubra Waldron Festuca saximontana Festuca scabrella Waldron Waldron Helictotrichon hookeri Waldron Hordeum jubatum Waldron Koeleria macrantha Waldron Muhlenbergia richardsonis Waldron Poa canbyi Waldron Poa compressa Waldron Poa cusickii Waldron Poa pratensis Waldron Poa sandbergii Waldron Stipa curtiseta Waldron Stipa viridula Waldron Carex filifolia Carex obtusata Waldron Waldron Carex pensylvanica Waldron Carex scirpoidea Waldron Carex stenophylla Waldron Achillea millefolium

Common dandelion Veiny meadow rue Golden bean White Dutch clover Wild vetch Wild vetch Early blue velvet Early blue velvet White camus Meadow parsnip Meadow parsnip Wheatgrass Northern wheatgrass Wheatgrass Crested wheatgrass Western wheatgrass Awned wheatgrass Slender wheatgrass Hairgrass Smooth brome Northern awnless brome Blue grama Reed grass Bluebunch fescue Creeping red fescue Sheep fescue Rough fescue Hooker's oat grass Foxtail barley June grass Mat muhly Canby bluegrass Canada bluegrass Cusick bluegrass Kentucky bluegrass Sandberg bluegrass Western porcupine grass Green needlegrass Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Sedge Yarrow

Waldron Allium cernumm Waldron Amaranthus albus Waldron Androsace septentrionalis Waldron Anemone cylindrica Waldron Anemone multifida Waldron Anemone patens Waldron Antennaria aprica Waldron Antennaria neglecta Waldron Antennaria parvifolia Waldron Antennaria rosea Waldron Arnica sp. Waldron Artemisia cana Waldron Artemisia frigida Waldron Artemisia ludoviciana Waldron Aster ericoides Waldron Aster falcatus Waldron Aster sp. Waldron Astragalus flexuosus Waldron Cirsium arvense Waldron Cirsium flodmanni Waldron Cirsium vulgare Waldron Comandra umbellata Waldron Cynoglossum officinale Waldron Descurainia sophia Waldron Eleagnus commutata Waldron Gaillardia aristata Galium boreale Waldron Waldron Gaura coccinea Waldron Gentianella amarella Waldron Geum triflorum Waldron Gutierrezia sarothrae Waldron Haplopappus spinulosus Waldron Heterotheca villosa Waldron Lappula occidentalis Waldron Lappula squarrosa Waldron Lepidium sp. Waldron Lithospermum ruderale Waldron Medicago sativa Waldron Monolepis nuttalliana Waldron **Opuntia** fragilis Waldron Oxytropis deflexa Waldron Oxytropis splendens Waldron Penstemon nitidus Waldron Phlox hoodii Waldron Polygonum arenastrum (aviculare)

Nodding onion Tumbleweed Fairy candelabra Long-fruited anemone Cut-leaved anemone Prairie crocus Pussy toes Pussy toes Pussy toes Pussy toes Amica Sagebrush Pasture sage Prairie sagewort Tufted white prairie aster Creeping white prairie aster Aster Milk vetch Canada thistle Flodman's thistle Bull thistle Bastard toadflax Hound's-tongue Tansy mustard Silver-berry Gaillardia Northern bedstraw Scarlet butterfly weed Felwort Three-flowered avens Broom snake-weed Haplopappus Hairy golden aster Blue burr Blue burr Peppergrass Puccoon Alfalfa Spear-leaved goosefoot Prickly pear cactus Reflexed locoweed Showy loco-weed Smooth blue beard-tongue Hood's phlox Common knotweed

Waldron Potentilla gracilis Waldron Potentilla hippiana Potentilla pensylvanica Waldron Waldron Rosa acicularis Waldron Rosa arkansana Waldron Salsola kali Selaginella densa Waldron Senecio canus Waldron Waldron Sisymbrium altissimum Sisyrinchium montanum Waldron Waldron Solanum triflorum Waldron Solidago missouriensis Waldron Solidago sp. Waldron Sphaeralcea coccinea Waldron Symphoricarpos occidentalis Waldron Taraxacum officinale Waldron Vicia americana Waldron Vicia sparsifolia Waldron Viola sp. Zigadenus venenosus Waldron

Graceful cinquefoil Cinquefoil Cinquefoil Prickly rose Prairie rose Russian thistle Little club moss Prairie groundsel Tumbling mustard Blue-eyed grass Wild tomato Missouri goldenrod Goldenrod Scarlet mallow Buckbrush Common dandelion Wild vetch Wild vetch Early blue velvet Death camas

Appendix II: Standard Errors And Significances For The Study Sites

 Table 1. Grass, forb and total herbaceous production standard errors and significance levels for main effects and two way interactions for the Milo sites.

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Grass	Standard Error	130	170	120
	Significance	0.03	0.86	0.02
Forb	Standard Error	90	50	130
	Significance	0.82	0.00	0.01
Total	Standard Error	170	150	170
	Significance	0.09	0.09	0.00

 Table 2. Grass, forb and total herbaceous production standard errors and significance levels for main effects and two way interactions for the Porcupine Hills sites.

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Grass	Standard Error	290	220	330
	Significance	0.08	0.21	0.72
Forb	Standard Error	140	190	190
	Significance	0.27	0.21	0.38
Total	Standard Error	260	240	290
	Significance	0.11	0.04	0.89

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Bare	Standard Error	3.5	5.6	5.3
Ground	Significance	0.008	0.073	0.003
Litter	Standard Error	4.8	3.8	3.5
	Significance	0.089	0.489	0.000

 Table 3. Bare ground and litter cover standard errors and significance levels for main effects and two way interactions for Milo sites with the native seed mix.

Table 4.Bare ground and litter cover standard errors and significance levels for main
effects and two way interactions for Milo sites with the non-native seed mix.

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Bare	Standard Error	2.6	5 4.6	3.3
Ground	Significance	0.05	2 0.016	0.000
Litter	Standard Error	3.8	3 5.5	3.6
	Significance	0.47	5 0.630	0.004

Table 5.Bare ground and litter cover standard errors and significance levels for main
effects and two way interactions for the Porcupine Hills sites.

-		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Bare Ground	Standard Error Significance	3.7 0.002		3.8 0.000
Litter	Standard Error Significance	3.6 0.000		8.3 0.036

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Grass	Standard Error	5.0	2.0	2.0
	Significance	0.92	0.10	0.05
Forb	Standard Error	14.2	3.0	8.0
	Significance	0.63	0.13	0.07
Total	Standard Error	9.0	5.0	4.0
	Significance	0.96	0.76	0.08

Table 6.Grass, forb and total herbaceous percent utilization standard errors and
significance levels for main effects and two way interactions for Milo sites.

Table 7. Grass, forb and total herbaceous percent utilization standard errors and significance levels for main effects and two way interactions for Porcupine Hills sites.

		Year	Treatment	Year By Treatment
Grass	Standard Error	8.0	8.0	10.0
	Significance	0.10	0.25	0.78
Forb	Standard Error	13.0	10.0	15.0
	Significance	0.05	0.23	0.09
Total	Standard Error	9.0	5.0	6.0
	Significance	0.06	0.23	0.34

Conditions of Use

Permission for non-commercial use, publication or presentation of excerpts or figures is granted, provided appropriate attribution is cited. Commercial reproduction, in whole or in part, is not permitted without prior written consent.

The use of these materials by the end user is done without any affiliation with or endorsement by TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. Reliance upon the end user's use of these materials is at the sole risk of the end user.